16. ***(Amended)*** A storage medium for storing machine readable code, the machine readable code being executable to evaluate characters in an electronic message according to the steps of:

(a) accepting an input of the characters of the message; and

(b) evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the comparing comprises the step of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.

18. ***(Amended)*** The storage medium of claim [17] 16, wherein the step of comparing each character comprises the step of testing the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for the character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character.

19. The storage medium of claim 18, wherein the universal code is Unicode.

20. The storage medium of claim 16, wherein the steps further comprise the step of(c) computing a total number of characters matched to each of the candidate character sets.

## REMARKS

This is a response to an Office Action mailed October 23, 2001 (Office Action). The Office Action has been reviewed, and in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested.

Attached to this Response is Appendix A, which represents the marked-up version of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16 and 18.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 2, 7, 12, AND 17 are cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, by this response. Therefore, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 are pending.

**Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 1-20 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Applicants respectfully traverse. However, in an effort to advance prosecution, applicants respectfully submit that a proper terminal disclaimer will be executed, if necessary, upon the indication of the allowability of the pending claims.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,548,507 ("Martino"). Applicants respectfully disagree that Martino anticipates claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20 as originally presented, however, in an effort to advance prosecution, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

The independent claims are amended to recite, *inter alia*, the features of "*comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.*" Martino does not disclose or suggest at least these features.

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Martino, at best, discloses, comparing "words" in a document, not "each character of the message." See, table 1, col. 5, lines 5-60, col. 9 lines 5-40. Thus, the claimed character by character comparison is not suggested or disclosed. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 all depend from one of claims 1, 6, 11, or 16, and, thus, contain the features recited therein. Applicants respectfully submit that, for at least this reason, claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 are also not anticipated by Martino. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 3-4, 8-9, 13-14 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Martino in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,111 ("Edberg"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 each contain features that are not suggested or disclosed by Martino. Claims 3-4, 8-9, 13-14 and 18-19 all depend from one of the independent claims, and, thus, contain the features recited therein. Edberg is relied upon to allegedly teach the "the benefit of using a collocation object and table" (Office Action, para. 7) and, thus, does not cure the deficiencies of Martino. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 3-4, 8-9, 13-14 and 18-19 is improper for failing to suggest or disclose each feature of the claims and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

It is believed that no other fees are due in connection with filing this Response. In the event that it is determined that fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0311.

Respectfully submitted,

Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky and Popeo, PC

Dated: January 23, 2002

By: _____
Christopher J. Cuneo
Registration No. 42,450

11911 Freedom Drive, Suite 400
Reston, VA 20190
Telephone (703) 464-4800
Facsimile (703) 464-4895

# VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

**In the specification:**



The title of the invention has been amended as follows:

"SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR EVALUATING [CHARACTER SETS] CHARACTERS IN A MESSAGE"

**In the Claims:**

Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16 and 18 have been amended as follows:

1. **(Amended)** A method of evaluating characters in a message, comprising the steps of:

(a) accepting an input of the characters of the message; and

(b) evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the comparing comprises the step of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.

2. **Cancelled**

3. **(Amended)** The method of claim [2] 1, wherein the step of comparing each character comprises the step of testing the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the

candidate character sets contains that character.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein the universal code is Unicode.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of(c) computing a total number of characters matched to each of the candidate character sets.

6. **(Amended)** A system for evaluating characters in a message, comprising:

an input interface to accept an input of the characters of the message;

and a processor unit, connected to the input interface, the processor unit evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the processor unit compares each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.

7. **Cancelled**

8. **(Amended)** The system of claim [7] 6, wherein the processor unit tests the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character.

9. The system of claim 8, wherein the universal code is Unicode.

10. The system of claim 6, wherein the processor unit computes a total number of characters matched to each of the candidate character sets.

11. **(Amended)** A system for evaluating characters in a message, comprising:

input interface means to accept an input of the characters of the message; and

processor means, connected to the input interface means, the processor means evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the processor means compares each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.

12. **Cancelled**

13. **(Amended)** The system of claim [12] 11, wherein the processor means tests the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character.

14. The system of claim 13, wherein the universal code is Unicode.

15. The system of claim 11, wherein the processor means computes a total number of characters matched to each of the candidate character sets.

16. **(Amended)** A storage medium for storing machine readable code, the machine readable code being executable to evaluate characters in an electronic message according to the steps of:

(a) accepting an input of the characters of the message; and

(b) evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message wherein the comparing

comprises the step of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank.

17. **Cancelled**

18. **(Amended)** The storage medium of claim [17] 16, wherein the step of comparing each character comprises the step of testing the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for the character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character.

19. The storage medium of claim 18, wherein the universal code is Unicode.

20. The storage medium of claim 16, wherein the steps further comprise the step of(c) computing a total number of characters matched to each of the candidate character sets.